

But here in this legislation, something that we seldom see, at least I have not seen in the years that I have been here, a specific delineation of eligibility or ineligibility for benefits to a group of citizens of the United States merely because their status was initially that of a legal immigrant, subsequently becoming naturalized and still being barred from the rights and privileges of citizenship. I think that is fundamentally wrong and basically contrary to the Constitution that guarantees equal protection and due process.

I regret that the Senate bill makes that further distinction, not just categorizing the legal immigrants as the House bill does. The House bill has a series of prohibitions to the legal immigrants, but those prohibitions stop just as soon as that individual becomes a U.S. citizen. On the Senate side, those prohibitions continue irrespective of citizenship. I certainly think that that is a provision in the law which has gone too far.

For the reasons that I have stated thus far, I am hoping that the White House and the leaders in the administration that have been following this matter will take a hard look at the legislation that has just passed the Senate and review it carefully, and if it comes out of the conference committee in no better shape than the Senate version, I strongly urge that the White House veto that measure.

Again to reiterate, the most egregious change that has been accepted by both the House and the Senate versions on welfare reform is to repeal and nullify and rescind the most important aspect of the aid to dependent children program, and that is the concept of entitlement which guarantees to children, if they meet the eligibility standards, to have the support of the program.

That guarantee has been removed from the legislation in both the House and the Senate versions, and they have moved to a block grant which leaves to the 50 States the total authority to establish the criteria, the benefit package, and the eligibility. So we will have 50 different programs, 50 different standards, 50 different eligibilities.

I believe that that does ill service to this Nation that has committed over and over again its responsibilities to children. Aid to dependent children, that is, the welfare program, is a program for children. We cannot dismiss that. We cannot forget it. That is what the welfare program is. It is designed to provide care and support and sustenance for our children.

There are 9 million children currently on welfare. It is for these children that we have to assume our responsibility as a nation. I believe that the Senate version dismisses that responsibility without considering what the consequences might well be.

We have heard so much of late, as we arrive at the great national debates leading up to the Presidential elections, about the commitment of this

Nation to family values. I stand very strongly on that commitment to family values.

That is what I base my whole approach on in analyzing the welfare reform bill. How closely does it adhere to my principles of family values? To what extent is protection of the child of paramount concern in the legislation that we vote for or we support? It seems to me it is that guiding principle of the family that has to motivate us in drafting legislation.

What is going to happen to thousands of these families that will not qualify for welfare assistance because they do not quite meet the local standards of eligibility is that they will be without funds. There will be charges made by the States of child neglect because the single parents will not be able to provide them with shelter.

We have read in the newspapers numerous accounts of this already occurring, where a single parent is found huddled in an automobile somewhere in the suburbs trying to keep their family together, and then being arrested by the State authorities for child neglect, and the children then being separated from the single parent and being made wards of the State and put into either orphanages or foster care homes. That is not the scene that I believe a nation committed to family values should support.

Our obligation is to try to continue to the largest extent possible the nurturing care that a parent has naturally for his or her children. I fear that this principle is being dismissed too cavalierly in favor of forcing single parents, most of whom on welfare being women, forcing them to work as the moral obligation which we are underwriting in this welfare legislation. The welfare legislation will be forcing them to work rather than staying at home and providing this family care for their children. I think that this is a very egregious mistake.

If the work ethic is so important and has now become paramount to nurturing of our children, then certainly we have to make it possible for these individuals to get the training they need, to get the job that allows them to support their families without government assistance, and the child care that goes along with it.

So the package of reforms that I see as being compatible with the argument of family values is one that is predicated upon our sense of responsibility to our children, making sure that if the parent must go out to work, that there is adequate child care, and that the breadwinner for that family has a job that can support that family without government assistance.

It seems to me that is where reform ought to take us. It seems to me that that is what has been wrong with the welfare program thus far. It has been lacking in the support elements to enable parents to go out to work.

I look forward to continued debate on this issue. I take great umbrage at the

commentators who argue that the debate is over and that it is merely a matter of the two Houses coming together with their two versions and compromising, and the assumption is that the President will sign whatever bill comes out.

I hope that is not the case. I hope the White House reads the fine print, and that ultimately the principles of family values will prevail in the Congress of the United States for the sake of our children.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOGGETT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. VENTO.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. YOUNG of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FORBES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MINK of Hawaii) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. SEASTRAND.

Mr. HINCHEY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 27, 1995, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1456. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled the "Gold Bullion Coin Amendments of 1995"; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1457. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 95-43: Drawdown of Commodities and Services from the Department of the Treasury to support the continued presence and activities of United States members of the EU/OSCE Sanctions Assistance Missions on the borders of Serbia and Montenegro, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2348a; to the Committee on International Relations.

1458. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1459. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination 95-38 regarding the eligibility for Mongolia to be furnished defense articles and services under the Foreign Assistance Act

and the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2311; to the Committee on International Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 2126. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-261). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

[Submitted September 22, 1995]

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1816. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than September 29, 1995.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STOCKMAN (for himself, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 2393. A bill to restore the second amendment rights of all Americans; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVERETT (for himself, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 2394. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 1995, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain requirements on States under the Medicaid Program with respect to minimum reimbursement levels for hospitals, nursing facilities, and intermediate care facilities; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SCHAEFER):

H.R. 2396. A bill to amend the Congressional Award Act to revise and extend authorities for the Congressional Award Board; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LIVINGSTON introduced a bill (H.R. 2397) for the relief of Jacqueline Darby-Maltbie; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 390: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 427: Mr. MARTINI.
H.R. 709: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 852: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1024: Mr. MARTINI.
H.R. 1514: Mr. MARTINI, Mr. ZELIFF, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BARR, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.
H.R. 1619: Mr. FOX and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 1627: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1762: Mr. JACOBS.
H.R. 1802: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1900: Mr. LUCAS and Ms. DANNER.
H.R. 1974: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2137: Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 2333: Mr. JACOBS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 743

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 7, line 10, before "Section" insert "(a) MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST.—"

Page 8, after line 2, insert the following:
(b) STRIKES, BOYCOTTS, AND HOT CARGO AGREEMENTS.—Section 8(b)(4) and subsection (e) of the National Labor Relations Act are repealed.

H.R. 743

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 7, line 10, before "Section" insert "(a) MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST.—"

Page 8, after line 2, insert the following:
(b) RIGHT TO FIRST CONTRACT.—Section 8(d) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by inserting after "Provided," the following:

That, if a collective bargaining agreement has not been reached within 45 days after certification, the union shall have the option of sending the contract dispute to compulsory and binding arbitration: *Provided further*,".

H.R. 743

OFFERED BY: MR. SAWYER

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the escalating demands of global competition have compelled an increasing number of employers in the United States to make dramatic changes in workplace and employer-employee relationships;

(2) such changes involve an enhanced role for the employee in workplace decisionmaking, often referred to as "Employee Involvement", which has taken many forms, including self-managed work teams, quality-of-worklife, quality circles, and joint labor-management committees;

(3) Employee Involvement programs, which operate successfully in both unionized and nonunionized settings, have been established by over 80 percent of the largest employers in the United States and exist in an estimated 30,000 workplaces;

(4) in addition to enhancing the productivity and competitiveness of businesses in the United States, Employee Involvement programs have had a positive impact on the lives of such employees, better enabling them to reach their potential in the workforce;

(5) recognizing that foreign competitors have successfully utilized Employee Involvement techniques, the Congress has consistently joined business, labor and academic leaders in encouraging and recognizing successful Employee Involvement programs in the workplace through such incentives as the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award;

(6) most employers who have instituted legitimate Employee Involvement programs have done so in order to enhance efficiency and quality rather than to interfere with the rights guaranteed to employees by the National Labor Relations Act; and

(7) the prohibition of the National Labor Relations Act against employer domination or interference with the formation or administration of a labor organization has produced some uncertainty and apprehension among employers regarding the continued development of Employee Involvement programs.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purpose of this Act is—

(1) to protect legitimate Employee Involvement programs against governmental interference;

(2) to preserve existing protections against deceptive, coercive employer practices; and

(3) to promote the enhanced competitiveness of American business by providing for the continued development of legitimate Employee Involvement programs.

SEC. 3. EMPLOYER EXCEPTION.

Section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the following:

"*Provided further*, That it shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under this paragraph for an employer to establish, assist, maintain, or participate in—

"(i) a method of work organization based upon employee-managed work units, notwithstanding the fact that such work units may hold periodic meetings in which all employees assigned to the unit discuss and, subject to agreement with the exclusive bargaining representative, if any, decide upon conditions of work within the work unit;

"(ii) a method of work organization based upon supervisor-managed work units, notwithstanding the fact that such work units may hold periodic meetings of all employees and supervisors assigned to the unit to discuss the unit's work responsibilities and in the course of such meetings on occasion discuss conditions of work within the work unit; or

"(iii) committees created to recommend or to decide upon means of improving the design, quality, or method of producing, distributing, or selling the employer's product of service, notwithstanding the fact that such committees on isolated occasions, in considering design quality, or production issues, may discuss directly related issues concerning conditions of work: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso shall not apply if—

"(A) a labor organization is the representative of such employees as provided in section 9(a);

"(B) the employer creates or alters the work unit or committee during organizational activity among the employer's employees or discourages employees from exercising their rights under section 7 of the Act;

"(C) the employer interferes with, restrains, or coerces any employee because of